

REMARKS

Request for Reconsideration

Applicants have carefully considered the matters raised by the Examiner in the Advisory Action but remain of the opinion that patentable subject matter is present. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Examiner's position based on the Response filed December 31, 2009 and the following remarks.

Claims Status

This Submission presumes that the Response filed December 31, 2009 has been entered and, thus, the amendments made herein to the claims are made based on entry of the amendments to the claims in the Response dated December 31, 2009.

Claims 1-5, 7-18 and 20-26 are pending in this Application.

Claims 4 and 7 have been amended herein to be in multiple dependent format. Because of these amendments, additional fees have been paid both for multiple dependent claims and for the additional dependent claims which have been generated due to the multiple dependency of Claims 4 and 7. Should any additional

fees be necessary for presentation of these claims, authorization is given to debit account #02-2275.

Response to Comments in Advisory Action

In the Advisory Action for Continuation of 11, the Examiner noted that the Tables do not show that the Priority Document supported Claims 6-11, 13 and 17-26.

First, the Examiner should note that the limitations of Claim 6 have been added to each of the independent claims herein, namely, Claims 1, 2, 3 and 7. This additional limitation of Claim 6 to these independent claims was made in the Response filed on December 31, 2009.

Second, the Examiner should note that the Table attached to the Response identifies where in the Priority Document the limitations from Claim 6 are supported. Specifically, the Examiner's attention is directed to Boxes 9 and 10 on page 1 which points out that the limitation "a discharge space of the first process is formed between a first electrode and a second electrode which are facing each other" is supported in the Priority Document in paragraphs 7 and 31 and in Figures 1-3. The limitation that "the first high frequency electric field is applied to the first electrode and the second high frequency

electric field is applied to the second electrode" is supported in the Priority Document in paragraph 37 and Figure 2.

Since each of the independent claims has been amended herein to recite the limitations of Claim 6, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection based on the combination of Horiike, US '479, Hwang and Suemasa is now overcome since this rejection was not directed to Claim 6.

With respect to the rejection based on the combination of Horiike, US '479, Hwang and US '136, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants have removed the reference US '136 on the basis that they have perfected their Priority claim with respect to the limitations in Claim 6 and based on the fact that they have made the necessary statement under 35 USC 103 so as to remove US '136 as a viable Prior Art reference under 103.

Respectfully, given the fact that each of the independent claims recites the limitations of Claim 6 and that Applicants have perfected their priority with respect to the limitations of Claim 6, it is submitted that the claims are patentable over the cited references taken alone or in combination.

One Month Extension of Time

Applicants hereby petition for a one-month extension of time within which to file this Request for Continued Examination and this Submission. Should any additional fees or extensions of time be necessary in order to maintain the Application in pending condition, appropriate requests are hereby made and authorization is given to debit Account #02-2275.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the Application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

By: Donald C. Lucas
Donald C. Lucas, Reg. # 31,275
(Attorney for Applicant)
475 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10016
Tel. # (212) 661-8000

DCL/mr